

REMARKS

Pending Claims

Claims 1-18 and 25-27 are pending for reexamination and a Request for Continued Examination has been submitted herewith.

35 USC § 112

Claim 25 has been amended to overcome the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 25-27, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions.

35 USC § 103

The claims have been rejected as being unpatentable over Adler et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,275,599 in view of Manjunath et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,332,030, and further in view of the admitted prior art (APA) (applied to claims 1-5, 11 and 16-18) and Clark et al (applied to claims 6, 7 and 9), Bodnar et al (applied to claim 8) Linnartz (applied to claim 10), Sadjadian (applied to claims 12-15) or Reasoner, Jr. (applied to claims 25-27). Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and for the following reasons.

Each of independent claims 1, 11, 16 and 25 has been amended to include difference detection means and judgment means. In particular, the difference detection means calculates a difference between pixels of two camera image data that is input at different times from the camera. Further, the difference is obtained for each pixel. The judgment means judges that when the difference is larger than a predetermined value, a block of given size including pixels from which the difference is obtained corresponds to a moving portion in the camera image data. Support for the amendments is provided on page 40, line 14 to page 41, line 27 of the specification with reference to Figs. 5 and 15 of the present application. Independent claims 1, 11 and 16 have further been amended to include that the supplement information image data is visible in the block indicating the moving portion in the camera image data. In claim 25, the second image data is claimed as being visible in a block indicating the moving portion in the first image data, when data obtained by the first encoding means are displayed.


None of the art of record, including Adler, Manjunath and the admitted prior art (APA) disclose or suggest the

combination of the invention set forth in amended claims 1, 11, 16 and 25. Further, since claims 2-10, 12-15, 17, 18 and 26-27 are dependent claims, each of these claims should at least be found to be allowable along with the base claim from which each depends. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Reexamination and allowance of the application are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks.

Respectfully submitted,



John R. Mattingly
Registration No. 30,293
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: June 28, 2004